

sively in computing value. He wrote: "The weight to be given to historical cost and to cost of reproduction new is to be determined in the light of the facts of the particular case."

This "light" throws a feeble glimmer in the tangled forests of public utility law. "Facts" are of no help in determining how much weight must be given to each factor. What is necessary is rules, based not on arbitrary intuitions but on logic. In this situation such rules are impossible to formulate. If the Supreme Court had directed that fair value be fixed at some point between historical and reproduction cost, the lack of meaning of such an arbitrary direction would have been apparent. So the Court hedged, as it has hedged ever since the first public-utility valuation case came before it in 1898. It refused to formulate a workable method of choosing between original cost and reproduction cost. The result is that public-utility commissioners, in addition to being lawyers, economists, and engineers, must also be psychics. They must guess which way the Court will jump next, because it is impossible to know which theory to follow, or how much weight to give each factor of value.

Had the California commission not feared an arbitrary reversal, it might have reduced the rate base to as low a figure as \$45,000,000 by subtracting from its valuation figure the entire amount of the depreciation reserve. This would have resulted in an additional annual saving to consumers of at least \$1,500,000 and reduced the company's revenues by 18 percent instead of 9 percent. Despite this additional reduction, the company would still have been able to pay a 9-percent dividend on its common stock in 1931, the second year of the depression.

The solution of the problem is to deprive the Federal courts of power to interfere with the rulings of public-utility commissioners. This would require legislation. If such legislation be declared unconstitutional, as it may well be, a constitutional amendment would then be necessary in order to make this change. In the many years that would have to elapse before such an amendment became law State ownership ought to be sought. Under State ownership the troublesome question of valuation for rate-making purposes would never arise. The present system of regulation is defended today only by the public utilities.

FARM RELIEF

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD a very interesting article written by Charles S. Barrett on the subject of "The Roosevelt Farm Bill." It relates to the subject of farm legislation recently enacted.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROOSEVELT FARM BILL

By Charles S. Barrett

I have been asked at least a thousand times what I thought of the Roosevelt farm bill. The bill is a good one. The truth about this matter is the Congress of the United States never passed a farm bill that was not good. The trouble has never been in the law itself, it has always been in the administration of the law. A good law can be made to operate and have the effect of a bad law, and a bad law can be made to operate and have the effect of a good law.

FOUNDATIONS RIGHT

Take the late Federal Marketing Act with its Federal Farm Board. It was a good law. No better law was ever passed. Administration was the only trouble with that law. Practically everything that was ever started in good faith for the American farmer was good. Every one of the farm organizations that this country has ever known was founded on principles that were all right. The Grange, the American Society of Equity, the Farmers Alliance, the Agricultural Wheel, the Farmers Mutual Benefit Association, the Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, the Gleaners, etc., all were founded on wise principles. The only trouble that any of them ever had was in their administration.

LAW, ADMINISTRATORS, FARMERS

Those who administer government or organizations or laws will never get very far until they thoroughly understand that there is more in the administration than there is in the law itself.

Millions and millions of times it has been said that the farmer wouldn't do. They say he is too independent; they say he is too stubborn; they say he is too individualistic and noncooperative; they say he is too stupid. I will admit that there is some truth in what they say about him. This is largely due to the manner in which he has been treated in the administration of the various acts which have been passed supposedly for his benefit.

FATE OF STRONG-ARM TACTICS

Now, the Farm Board Act was administered as though its administrators had been chosen by God Almighty to save the American farmer against his own stupidity. Likewise, its manner of administration psychologized the American farmer into believing that someone was jamming something down his throat. Thus before this great act had been long in existence, an undercover opposition of the farmers to the Farm Board, and the Farm Board to the farmers, was in evidence.

The administrators of that act carried the thought which they actually often expressed, "Whip the farm leaders into line." No one questioned then, or now, the actual desire of the administrators to save American agriculture as a family unit industry. Their approach to a method of administration of this great act was where all the trouble existed.

OPPORTUNITY THREATENED BY STUPIDITY

Now the farmers of this country are not going to be "whipped into line." They are in line now. And if some missteppers don't get the farmers out of step, the present Roosevelt farm bill has the opportunity to preserve American agriculture as we know it should be. By the proper administration of this act, not only will the farmers be served but the rural towns may be preserved, business be stimulated, bankruptcy stopped, and the Nation placed back on the road to or in full recovery.

The farmer has dealt with nature and nature's God and thus has become a generous, charitable, and patient individual, in most cases without the opportunities of great scholastic attainment, rarely placed in the position of authority in public affairs or in the securing of common justice for society. If those who administer in the name of agriculture are not more stupid than they charge the farmer with being, then we will begin to get somewhere.

IGNORANT INTELLIGENCE

I honestly believe that ignorance among the powers that be is the greatest of all crimes. They have gone through the colleges of our country, and therefore are supposed to be educated. Their opportunities in life have carried them into the far places and high places. They are cultured to the point of great intelligence, but when it comes to some simple but important thing often show amazing ignorance. Their ignorance of this real farm problem is the crime of the age when they accept places of power and responsibility. Will they continue to attempt to manhandle the farmers of this Nation and know more about everything connected with agriculture than those who deal with it, who are of it, and who have graduated from its schools of common sense and experience?

KNOWING HOW, ESSENTIAL

I am telling you that this patient creature, the farmer, will not always be patient. We already hear the rumblings in the Middle West.

In the Roosevelt farm bill there is plenty of authority and plenty of money. If it does not properly succeed, it will not be on account of the farmer.

I declare to you that you can get the farmer to do anything that is right if you know how, but you have just got to know how. You have got to know how his mind works. You have got to know what is in his mind, what it is susceptible to, what is repellent to it, what he and his family suffer individually and collectively, what they enjoy. In fact, you have got to eat and sleep with the farmer to know anything about the farm problem whatsoever.

AMAZING POSSIBILITIES IN THE FARM LAW

You have got to know his likes and dislikes. You have got to know his friends and enemies; his heroes and martyrs. You have got to know whom he will follow and whom he will not follow. You have got to know every monkey-wrench thrower and every constructive fixer. You have got to know how to slip rubber pads between the monkey wrench and where it hits. You have got to know the American farmer to know anything about the farm problem.

This new farm law is a great law with amazing possibilities. There is not the least doubt about the sincere desire for making it a success on the part of those responsible for its operation. There is no room for doubt about their scholastic training and their great intelligence. Only time will tell whether we are to be victims again of the ignorance of intelligent people.

P.S.—We are all for results and should all do everything we can to make them satisfactory. But patience, in time, runs out. So here is hoping patience endures until relief comes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, if there be no further business, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 29, 1933, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, MAY 27, 1933

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast made the earth by Thy power, established the world by Thy wisdom, and stretched forth the heavens by Thy understanding. We therefore humble ourselves at Thy footstool. In all our ways may we acknowledge Thee. We pray Thee that Thou wouldst sustain us in that glad confidence and in that calm assurance that all things work together for good to them that love Thee. As Thy moral law is perfect in its character and perpetual in its obligation, may we make it our way by intelligent obedience. For everything that makes life better, happier, and richer, for all the mercies that turn our days into

strength and encouragement, and for the sweet memories of those blessings that abide while time shall last, we are thankful to Thee, our Heavenly Father, upon earth through the name of Christ, our redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Rules may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCE. Reserving the right to object, the last time I made a request to file minority views my recollection is that I asked to have the minority views printed with the majority views. Somehow the request was overlooked.

Mr. BYRNS. I will include it in my request that the majority report and minority views may be filed before 12 o'clock tonight and printed in the same document.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to announce to Members that the Rules Committee will have a meeting immediately after adjournment today.

Mr. McFADDEN. Can the gentleman from Tennessee tell us how much time there will be to discuss the matter?

Mr. BYRNS. I cannot tell. That will be decided by the Rules Committee.

Mr. McFADDEN. May I say that I hope there will be a liberal time given for the discussion.

Mr. BYRNS. I am sure that the Rules Committee and the chairman are in favor of a liberal time.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee when he expects the legislation reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency will be brought up?

Mr. BYRNS. The object in meeting today was that the committee might report, so that the business might be brought up on Monday, if, after the suspension of the rules, there is time. The Speaker has several suspensions in mind. I am unable to say whether they will be disposed of in time to take this up or not. But there will be no disposition to hold the House for a late session on Monday.

Mr. MAPES. I realize that this is largely a formal matter—that if one objected to the request of the gentleman, the only result would be to keep the House in session waiting for the report, and so nothing would be gained by an objection. But I should like to express my own feelings about the matter. I think it is a violent procedure, to bring up a bill of such importance that was only introduced yesterday, which has been considered by the Banking and Currency Committee only 1 day, and I think with very limited hearings, if any. The Members of the House and the country have had no time to study and digest it. I think it is a violent procedure to bring it up in such a precipitous way for consideration by the House.

Mr. BYRNS. Let me say that it is a very short bill and only one question involved. I do not know whether there have been extensive hearings or not. We are all anxious to get through with the session as soon as we can.

Mr. MAPES. I realize that it is a short bill as far as language is concerned, but that does not minimize its importance.

Mr. BYRNS. I am not minimizing the importance of the bill.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. BEEDY. Just to correct the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] that this bill has been considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency. It may have been considered by part of that committee. I do not know as to that. As usual, I went to the Departments to keep appointments which I had made yesterday. At 10 o'clock this morning I got notice of the meeting. As soon as I could get here I did so, but found when I did get here that the committee had reported out a bill taking the country off the gold standard and repudiating most solemn con-

tracts made by the Government. Of course, some of you may think that it is not an event of any great consequence, but nobody had a chance to go into it, and I now hold in my hand for the first time a copy of the bill.

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, I do not think it does just what the gentleman says, but that is a matter for discussion.

Mr. BEEDY. It is absolutely as I state.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that these gentlemen will have this afternoon and all day tomorrow to study that short bill?

Mr. BEEDY. But the gentleman must realize that some of us go to church on Sunday.

Mr. SABATH. Well, in the morning; and with the intelligence that the gentleman possesses, it should not take him long to digest the bill.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. McFADDEN. In order to ask the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency whether or not any hearings were held on the bill.

Mr. STEAGALL. There were no hearings.

Mr. McFADDEN. So no study has been given to the bill other than just to draft it.

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, I might say to the gentleman that he does not mean to say there has been no study of everything involved in this legislation. The gentleman fully understands that the Banking and Currency Committee for many years has studied the various phases of this legislation, and in every direction.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be no objection to my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FARM CREDITS

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until 12 o'clock Monday to file a report upon the farm credits bill, which has been pending before the committee for several days. Of course, it is not intended to take that up on Monday, but we would like to have the bill printed so Members can see it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GOVERNORSHIP OF HAWAII

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until 12 o'clock tonight to file minority views upon the bill relating to the appointment of a Governor of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CENTURY OF PROGRESS EXPOSITION, CHICAGO

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall be obliged to object because the session today was with the expectation that nothing would be done except to get the permission which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] has already obtained. I do not think we want to stay here for any prolonged discussion. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withhold the objection.

Mr. SABATH. All I desire to say is this, that the great city of Chicago—

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. SABATH. All I wish to speak on is the opening of the Century of Progress Exposition in Chicago today. Surely the gentleman will not object to that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We all know about the opening of that fair; and if I permitted the gentleman to go ahead, I would be obliged to let others.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman withhold it for just a moment? He states that the country knows all about this fair. I do not question the gentleman's statement. The country should know about it, but I do not know whether the Members do, and I want to extend an invitation to the Members to attend the exposition.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have objected.

Mr. SABATH. All I desire to do is to extend the invitation to the Members of this House.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

CAN THE AMERICAN FARMER COME BACK?

Mr. KNUTE HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by publishing therein an address delivered over the radio on Can the American Farmer Come Back, by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTE HILL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by Hon. WALTER M. PIERCE, of Oregon:

Can the American farmer come back? This is the question asked whenever farmers meet or the subject is discussed. It is now generally admitted that the millions of Americans who do not live on farms cannot prosper until the farmer is again prosperous. On the other hand, the farmer cannot prosper until the industrial millions have purchasing power. During the last half century I have been closely connected with the farmers of the West, raising wheat, cattle, sheep, and hogs on a large scale. In legislative halls as State senator, as Governor of the State of Oregon, and now after a brief experience in the House of Representatives I have come into contact with those who are trying to bring relief to farmers, and I am today speaking to my fellow farmers to give you my views as to the future.

Six years ago this summer I read a remarkable article by Professor Dodd, of Chicago University, entitled "Must the American Farmer Sink to Peasantry?" I remember with what a shock I read the title and followed the careful reasoning of the historian; and when I discussed it in public, I felt that my audiences were amused rather than deeply concerned with Professor Dodd's prophecy, for that distinguished author proved that the economic trend would surely carry the American farmer to peasantry. Now, 6 years later, here in Washington, I find this word "peasant" on the lips of many in high official positions. They assume it is the inevitable future condition of the American farmer. I wonder if they think the American farmer when reduced to peasantry will sustain the present Government officials in their high offices and continue to build marble halls for public buildings! I repeat, today, what I have frequently said, that, if the farmer sinks to peasantry, he will carry with him the whole fabric of our present-day civilization, officialdom, universities, and popular education. These have been supported from the earnings of the farmer. Our civilization could not have been built on a class system.

In discussing irrigation farming recently with a high official, the question of taxes and maintenance per acre on irrigated tracts was brought up, and this official seemed surprised to learn that the maintenance charges and taxes of about \$5 an acre left no margin for the farmer, but represented a loss. Officialdom and city dwellers ask why the farmers remain on their farms, struggling through year after year of failure, unable to pay taxes, interest, and cost of production; going behind all the time. They do not seem to comprehend the fact that there is nothing else that the farmer can do. It would be folly for him to swell the crowds of unemployed in the cities. At any rate, the farmer has a roof and most of his food.

One of the principal causes of economic breakdown of American rural life is interest—high, immeasurably high interest—far beyond the ability of the producer to pay. Interest has always been cheaper in the East than in the West, where farmers have paid from 8 to 9 percent on well-secured loans. On Federal funds western farmers have paid from 5 to 9½ percent. By cheap interest I mean not 4½ or 5 percent, as now provided by the new farm law, but the cheapest interest at which Federal money is given to any industry. Remember that 4 percent now is equivalent to 16 percent at peak prices.

A second cause has been the excessive cost of transferring the product from the hands that produce to the mouths that consume. It is true that less than one third of the money paid by the consumer reaches the original producer. The transportation agencies, protected in their profits by Federal legislation, exact more than the producer gets. Think of the injustice of transportation lines collecting more freight rates now than in the prosperous days before the war! These excessive freight rates have made it impossible to conduct farming advantageously except in the few favored localities adjacent to the seaboard or large centers of population.

Another serious difficulty has been the contribution demanded by other utilities, those that give us light, power, water, and telephones. By special governmental privilege the owners of these necessities of life have been enabled to collect excessive profits,

which have not only raised rates to those who had these conveniences but have increased costs of things bought by farmers from merchants and manufacturers who charged these rates in their overhead.

The clearest statement I have found of this situation is made by Charles Beard in his history, *The Rise of American Civilization*, wherein he states: "In every age and in every clime where civilization has passed its most primitive form there has always appeared a small group of men devoted to finance, commerce, and industry, who have borne down with terrific oppression upon that group that derive their sustenance from agriculture." This has been true of bankers and implement manufacturers, as well as of railways. Debts have reached such a point today that they can never be paid. Mortgages and bonds are renewed or repudiated.

The long period of depression has pressed down upon the brow of the farmer a grievous crown of thorns in the form of mortgage foreclosures. With our banking system in chaos our land values have shrunk to the vanishing point. The mortgage provision in the farm relief law is far less helpful than the one I worked for as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, but it is a step toward justice. We must go farther. These foreclosures which are taking place throughout our land are making just as tragic an episode in American history as the selling of slaves in the public square.

Another basic difficulty has been taxation, the burden of Government being largely levied upon property instead of upon wealth measured by income and inheritance. Taxes upon property are levied without any regard to the ability to pay. To such colossal heights have taxes risen that it takes today practically the entire rental income to pay the taxes on most of the farm lands of the West. I find our national tax budget is so high that it threatens the very stability of our Government. It takes as much money to pay the annual interest on our national debt today as it took to run the entire Government when the other Roosevelt lived in the White House.

We cannot tax, borrow, nor bond ourselves into prosperity. The Grange has taken a stand against the sales tax. It is a tax on consumption, a tax on necessities, levied without any regard to ability to pay. Its general purpose is to relieve the rich and powerful and place the load on the backs of the already overburdened masses.

There are outstanding today fifty billions of tax-exempt bonds, practically one fourth of the wealth of the country, bearing no part of the burden of Government. Let us put a stop to this.

Unquestionably one of the real causes for the fall of the price of farm products is the lack of buying power among the consuming masses. I hold in my hand a chart published by the United States Department of Agriculture which shows most graphically that farm prices and the wages of industrial workers rise and fall together. Fifty billions of dollars has been the loss of buying power since the crash of October 1929—10 times the entire value of all farm products raised last year, including those consumed on the farms. We may have temporary restoration of prosperity, but its permanence depends on the adoption of measures which will increase the amount of money divided among the workers.

The farmer is politically helpless unless he is more strongly organized than any other group, because he is outnumbered and scattered. The great rich industries of the East have been created and fostered largely by privilege which has come from political power. The tariff for their benefit has practically ruined the farmers' foreign markets—one of the contributing causes of the downfall.

Whatever may be our plight today we must not lose heart; we must fight politically for economic justice and we shall struggle more hopefully because we have today in Washington an administration more sympathetic with the farmers than any that has preceded it.

I am a firm believer in the quantitative theory of money. My reading of history teaches me that among the great contributing factors that brought us out of the financial crash of 1893 was the addition to our gold supply from South Africa and Alaska, quadrupling in about 15 years the amount of gold used as money. If we cannot again repeat the experience of 30 years ago it seems to me the logical thing would be to coin silver—yes; at the ratio of 16 to 1, creating an unlimited demand for silver, thus raising commodity prices the world over. The President has been given that right and I believe he has the courage to use it. The law also gives him the right to cause to be issued three thousand millions of currency. How much better to issue currency than to create greater public debt by borrowing money through interest-bearing and nontaxable bonds. We farmers certainly agree with our President's statement in his radio speech on May 6, when he said: "Government credit and Government currency are really one and the same thing. Behind Government bonds there is only a promise to pay. Behind Government currency we have, in addition to the promise to pay, a reserve of gold and a small reserve of silver."

The causes of our troubles may be quickly summarized—interest, taxes, tax-exempt securities, fixed dividends for public utilities, high tariffs for the privileged few, lack of credit and adequate banking system, lack of buying power among the workers—all economic evils subject to correction through our political system.

Can the farmer come back? Yes; if he will use his governmental privileges. He can get cheaper and more plentiful money; he can reduce public expenditures; conditions can be made under which men will have jobs and buying power. He can insist upon

a guaranteed insurance for bank deposits so that we shall never again suffer the collapse of our banking system. We can accomplish this by the ballot, our strongest weapon, and in many States by the recall and the initiative and referendum—truly popular government. We cannot handle our new economic problems by old political methods.

The political alignment is wrong. It is apparent today that both parties have conservatives and liberals. The farmers of America may help themselves by voting for their own kind. There are no better legislators than intelligent, thinking farmers.

Let me say to my farmer friends today, join the farm organizations in the communities in which you live. In my State of Oregon we have an active, virile Grange of 25,000 members. We are interested in legislation and have in a remarkable way affected the political history of the State. Great organizations can effectively bring pressure upon the public and upon legislative bodies.

The farmer cannot stand alone. Only group action will be effective. The farmer cannot come back if he is silent and lets the world forget his economic distress. He must protest wrongs, but he need not resort to violence. The farmer cannot come back unless purchasing power is generally restored. No thinking person dreams of wealth equally distributed but great fortunes and immense aggregations of capital must, through the form of taxation, feel the effect of the leveling hand, so that wealth is equitably divided and opportunity is universal.

Can the farmer come back? Yes; if he may start the return journey without the back-breaking burden of all the accumulated debts of mortgage, interest, and taxes. Farmers must come back and will come back through their own efforts, politically and economically. We must support for public office men who will help us. We must not form our opinions from the advertising press alone; we must be serious students of public questions. We must read, think, discuss, and act. Farmers and industrial workers are interdependent. We went down together, we must rise together. "Live and let live." Our other Roosevelt understood this when he said that in the long run this country is not going to be a good place for any of us to live in unless it is a reasonably good place for all of us to live in.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a joint resolution of the Senate and General Assembly of the State of Illinois relative to the St. Lawrence waterway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Senate and General Assembly of the State of Illinois relative to the St. Lawrence waterway.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Edward J. Hughes, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true photostatic copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 27, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Illinois. Done at the city of Springfield this 25th day of May A.D. 1933.

[SEAL]

EDWARD J. HUGHES,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, FIFTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY 1933.

Senate Joint Resolution 27

Whereas a treaty relating to the St. Lawrence waterway has been negotiated between the United States and Canada which is now before the Senate for ratification; and

Whereas this treaty internationalized Lake Michigan, a body of water entirely within the limits of the United States, and places the control in an international joint commission; and

Whereas it embodies the order of the Supreme Court reducing the flow of water from Lake Michigan into the Chicago River to 1,500 cubic feet per second, and thereby makes this order unchangeable except by international agreement; and

Whereas 1,500 cubic feet per second, as provided in the treaty, is inadequate for the needs of the waterway from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, and is therefore injurious to the entire Mississippi Valley; and

Whereas by the terms of this treaty the cost of the undertaking is borne mainly by the United States and the benefits therefrom are received mainly by Canada; and

Whereas not only are valuable rights of the whole United States surrendered by the treaty for no adequate consideration, but it constitutes a gross injustice to the State of Illinois against which Illinois should have the joint protection and support of its sister States; and

Whereas our two United States Senators, LEWIS and DIETERICH, are making a steadfast fight on behalf of the people of this State against the treaty in its present form: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Fifty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the house of representatives concurring

herein), That the General Assembly of the State of Illinois petition the Senate of the United States to disapprove and refuse to ratify the proposed treaty, to the end that a fair and just agreement may be negotiated between the United States and Canada; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and joint resolution be transmitted forthwith to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the senate May 16, 1933.

THOMAS F. DONOVAN,
President of the Senate.
A. E. EDEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house of representatives May 16, 1933.

ARTHUR ROE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
CHAS. P. CASEY,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. OLIVER of Alabama, for 3 days, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. CLARK of North Carolina, for several days, on account of important business.

To Mr. KEE, for several days, on account of important business.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House yesterday on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the passage of the public-works bill.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman withhold that?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I will withhold it temporarily.

Mr. MORAN. The question, I am sure, is of interest to all Members of the House, and if not given at this time it will not be of value. I have only asked for 3 minutes. It relates to Memorial Sunday and the situation in respect to the attitude of one of the departments of Government.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. May I ask the gentleman is he asking to consider a bill?

Mr. MORAN. Nothing to do with considering a bill or any legislation.

Mr. BYRNS. Because I gave my promise there would be no business transacted today.

Mr. MORAN. It is not with regard to any business to be called up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am going to permit the gentleman to speak 3 minutes, but at the conclusion of his remarks I shall raise the question of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MORAN].

There was no objection.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow small groups of our citizens will repair to the various national cemeteries for the purpose of decorating the graves of the veterans. It so happens that this particular year a new problem arises through the attitude of one of our departments of Government that I think should be made known to the Members of this House. I will take, for illustration, the cemetery at the National Soldiers Home, Togus, Maine. In that particular cemetery there are 3,500 Civil War veterans buried. It has been the custom in the past to decorate those graves with the usual small flags, and leave those flags there during the summer. I can assure any of you who have never passed that particular cemetery that it is an inspiring picture to see those decorations. This year, however, a new regulation goes into effect which applies not only to that cemetery but to all other national cemeteries. It is this,

that the flags which may be set tomorrow in some localities, or on Memorial Day in other localities, are to be removed the day after Memorial Day, or May 31. A short time ago it was my privilege to go to Gettysburg and witness the scene there, where one of my own ancestors fought, and I cannot help a feeling of consecration to duty as I see a thing of that sort. For some official in Washington to require the removal of those flags on May 31 is abhorrent to me; it violates the American custom of proper commemoration. I have protested to the Veterans' Bureau against this ruling, and I hope it may be changed before it is too late.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I question the presence of a quorum.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Monday, May 29, 1933, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

81. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 17, 1933, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of waterway connecting Core Sound and Beaufort Harbor, N.C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on the Territories. H.R. 5767. A bill to authorize the appointment of the Governor of Hawaii without regard to his being a citizen or resident of Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 168). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 192. Joint resolution to assure uniform value to the coins and currencies of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BANKHEAD: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 161. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 192, a joint resolution to assure uniform value to the coins and currencies of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 170). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5508) for the relief of John Frank Peters, and the same was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILCOX: A bill (H.R. 5811) granting the consent of Congress to the Overseas Road and Toll Bridge District, a political subdivision of the State of Florida, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges across the navigable waters in Monroe County, Fla., from Lower Matecumbe Key to No Name Key; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H.R. 5812) to provide for the prevention of blindness in infants born in the Dis-

trict of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H.R. 5813) to amend section 4 of the act approved March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to supplement the naturalization laws, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 1512); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: Resolution (H.Res. 161) providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 192, a joint resolution to assure uniform value to the coins and currencies of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H.R. 5814) for the relief of Mollie J. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DIRKSEN: A bill (H.R. 5815) for the relief of Carl C. Block; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H.R. 5816) granting a pension to Addie E. Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H.R. 5817) for the relief of the Mary Black Clinic; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H.R. 5818) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRAEGER: A bill (H.R. 5819) for the relief of John Micklos; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1209. By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of Rutland Post, No. 31, of the American Legion, opposing removal of Burlington regional office of Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1210. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of Los Angeles Chapter, No. 5, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, urging Mr. KRAMER to insist in the Democratic caucus that Congress does not adjourn until President changes regulations and gives back to service-connected disabled veterans those rights, schedules, ratings, retirements, compensations, presumptions, and pensions that were enjoyed prior to the passage of Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1211. By Mr. LEHR: Petition of voters of Washtenaw County, asking that the Presidential public-works program be financed by the issue of legal-tender Government national notes instead of interest-bearing tax-exempt bond issues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1212. By Mr. LESINSKI: Petition of Gaelic League of Detroit, Mich., protesting against cancelation, revision, modification, or the extension of time for payment of any installment of public debts due to the United States from foreign countries under existing debt agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1213. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of American Manufacturers Export Association, New York City, urging the delegation by Congress to the President of full powers to negotiate and conclude reciprocal tariff arrangements between the United States and other individual nations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1214. Also, petition of the New York Lumber Trade Association, New York City, concerning tariff on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1215. Also, petition of National Woman's Party, New York City, urging the passage of House bill 3673; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1216. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of National Women's Party, New York City committee, favoring the passage of House bill 3673; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.